

**REMARKS/ARGUMENTS**

Claims 11-19, 30-38, and 40-44 are currently pending. Applicants have amended claims 11, 19, 30, 38, 40, and 41. Applicants submit that no new matter has been added as a result of these amendments.

Claims 34 and 35 stand objected for various informalities.

Claims 11-19, 30-38, and 40-44 stand rejected under 35 U.S.C. §103(a).

Reconsideration in view of the foregoing amendments and the following remarks is respectfully requested.

**Objections to Claims**

Claims 34 and 35 stand objected for various informalities. Claims 34 and 35 were objected to as appearing to incorrectly depend from claim 43. Applicants respectfully traverse.

Claims 34 and 35 were amended to depend from claim 43, which was newly added in the amendment filed on June 15, 2007. Thus, the dependency of claims 34 and 35 is proper.

Accordingly, withdrawal of the objections to claims 34 and 35 is respectfully requested.

**Rejections under 35 U.S.C. §103**

Claims 11-14, 17, 18, 30-33, 36, 37 and 40 stand rejected under 35 U.S.C. §103(a) as being unpatentable over Adobe Acrobat Reader, published 1999 (hereinafter "Acrobat Reader") and in view of U.S. Patent No. 5,546,502 to Hart et. al (hereinafter "Hart") and in further view of U.S. Patent No. 6,326,957 to Nathan et al. (hereinafter "Nathan"). Claims 15, 19, 34, 38, and 41-43 stand rejected under 35 U.S.C. §103(a) as being unpatentable over Acrobat Reader, in view of U.S. Patent No. 6,339,437 to Nielsen et al. (hereinafter "Nielsen") and in further view of Hart and further in view of Nathan.

Solely in order to expedite prosecution and without conceding to the merits of the rejections, Applicants have amended independent claims 11, 19, 30, 38, 40, and 41 and Applicants submit that even if Acrobat Reader, Hart, Nathan, and Nielsen could be combined as

suggested in the Office Action, the combination fails to teach all of the elements of independent claims 11, 19, 30, 38, 40, and 41. For example, independent claim 11 recites, in part:

displaying a section of the document in a first viewing area of a display including displaying annotations that visually emphasize portions of the document that are relevant to the first concept, the annotations visually highlighting portions of the document that include of one or more keywords associated with the one or more concepts and identified from a plurality of keywords stored for the first concept, wherein each annotation visually emphasizes the one or more keywords and related text surrounding the locations of the one or more keywords;

displaying a single thumbnail image in a second viewing area of the display based on the contents extracted from the document, the single thumbnail image displaying the contents of the document including the annotations in a continuous non-paginated form;

Applicants submit that the combination of Acrobat Reader, Hart, Nathan, and Nielsen fail to disclose or suggest at least these features of claim 1.

The Office Action relies upon Nielson to teach annotations (formerly recited in claims 19, 38, 41). Nielson is directed to techniques for relevance-enhanced scrolling. The system of Nielson merely accepts a set of query terms from a user and marks those keywords in the document to emphasize the keywords. See Nielson, col. 4, lines 52-67. In contrast, the method recited in claim 1 advantageously visually emphasizes not only portions of the text that include keywords but also emphasizes related text surrounding the locations of the keywords. As a result, a user can quickly scan through the contents of the document and recognize portions of the document that may be of interest the user. The annotations to the document are also displayed in the thumbnail view of the document provided by the single thumbnail image. The advantages of visually emphasizing entire portions of the document related to a keyword rather than just the keywords only (as in Nielson) are readily apparent, because the thumbnail image provides a continuous non-paginated view of the document in which the annotated portions of text are represented. In the reduced-sized view provided by the thumbnail image, emphasizing entire portions of the document enables the user to more easily discern those portions of the document that include text related to the user's concepts of interest.

Appl. No. 09/636,039  
Amdt. dated September 8, 2008  
Amendment under 37 CFR 1.116 Expedited Procedure  
Examining Group 2178

PATENT

For at least the reasons provided, the combination of Acrobat Reader, Hart, Nathan, and Nielsen do not disclose or suggest all of the features of claim 1. Applicants further submit that independent claims 19, 30, 38, 40, and 41 are also allowable for the same reasons as claim 11, and others. Furthermore, dependent claims 12-18 and 42, which depend from claim 11, dependent claims 31-37 and 43, which depend from independent claim 30, and dependent claim 44, which depends from independent claim 41, are also allowable at least due to their dependence from claims 11, 30, and 41, respectively.

Accordingly, Applicants respectfully request that the rejection of claims 11-19, 30-38, and 40-44 be withdrawn.

CONCLUSION

In view of the foregoing, Applicants believe all claims now pending in this Application are in condition for allowance and an action to that end is respectfully requested.

If the Examiner believes a telephone conference would expedite prosecution of this application, please telephone the undersigned at 858-350-6100.

Respectfully submitted,



Jeffrey S. King  
Reg. No. 58,791

TOWNSEND and TOWNSEND and CREW LLP  
Two Embarcadero Center, Eighth Floor  
San Francisco, California 94111-3834  
Tel: 858-350-6100  
Fax: 415-576-0300  
JSK:sjs  
61432823 v1